To: Maldonado, Zelma[Maldonado.Zelma@epa.gov]
Cc: Opila, MaryCate[Opila.MaryCate@epa.gov]; Vazquez, Natalia[Vazquez.Natalia@epa.gov]; Loukeris, Constantinos[loukeris.constantinos@epa.gov]; Chapman, Apple[Chapman.Apple@epa.gov]; Secrest, Cary[Secrest.Cary@epa.gov]; Williams, Christopher[Williams.Christopher@epa.gov]
From: Hosford, Chip
Sent: Mon 7/20/2015 8:03:08 PM
Subject: FW: information

Bowen (Chip) Hosford
Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance
Air Protection Division
Region III
U.S. EPA
215-814-3158

-----Original Message-----
From: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2015 3:52 PM
To: Snyder, Doug
Cc: Hosford, Chip
Subject: Re: information

Doug- good to meet you. Your request is consistent with what we discussed Thursday- I should have the same either this pm or tomorrow am. Best regards,

Chris

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2015, at 3:22 PM, Snyder, Doug <Snyder.Doug@epa.gov<mailto:Snyder.Doug@epa.gov>> wrote:

Chris,

I am the Region 3 attorney that has been assigned to this matter by Donna Mastro, my supervisor. I was out last week and therefore unable to participate in Thursday's call, but am back in the office and eager to move this forward. Along those lines, I had a discussion with EPA R3's Chip Hosford re: the information MarkWest (MW) has provided. Chip specifically asked me to thank you for sending the charts and the table with expected VOC emissions from each location/station. However, could your client also provide some information as to how the "Total Calculated VOC Emissions (tpy)" for each location/station was calculated? Did MW use a computer model? If so, were standard emission factors (such as AP-42) entered into the model, or were emission factors derived from actual testing data taken at each (or some) of the locations? If MW followed the same procedure to calculate emissions from each station, could you provide one description of the calculation procedure and the inputs used for each calculation? At some point in time, no matter what legal vehicle is used to resolve this matter, EPA will need to have confidence in both the initial emission estimates and the significantly-reduced emission estimates following installation of controls by MW.

Please call me if you wish to discuss this request. I look forward to hearing from you soon. Thanks.

Doug Snyder
Assistant Regional Counsel
US EPA Region 3
(215) 814-2692

From: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2015 5:25 PM
To: Hosford, Chip; Snyder, Doug; Chapman, Apple; Maldonado, Zelma; Mastro, Donna; Caballero, Kathryn; Heilman, Michael; jepps@pa.gov<mailto:jepps@pa.gov>; mgorog@pa.gov<mailto:mgorog@pa.gov>; nelson.cohen@usdoj.gov<mailto:nelson.cohen@usdoj.gov>
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Subject: information

All- please see the attached. PID 1 represents a site that is high pressure only, PID 2 include high pressure and low pressure, and the final drawing is for the compressor stations.

In terms of a description of pigging at the Drugmand site, per our discussion, pigging operations have been suspended at the Drugmand site, though such suspensions are not optimal to the long-term operation of the line. Pigging is a desired and necessary maintenance component of pipeline operation. Water and natural gas liquids can condense out of the gas streams as it cools and contacts the pipe wall and pocket in low places, which affects flow efficiency and can lead to corrosion. Because every pipeline is different, there is not a set schedule for pigging a line. Frequency will depend on a number of factors, including ambient temperatures and product. Currently twice per day is considered the optimum frequency at the Drugmand site.

I look forward to speaking with you next week.

Chris

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy